

Remarks:

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 17 and cancelled claim 3 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The amendments to claims 1 and 11 are supported by the specification at page 6, lines 16-18.

Applicants have amended claims 10, 15, and 17 to ensure that antecedent basis exists for all terms. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 2,058,482 to Feldmesser. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 7-9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldmesser.

Feldmesser does not disclose the invention recited in independent claims 1 and 11 since, among other things, Feldmesser does not disclose a bushing that includes an insulating core including a composite material including epoxy resin impregnated paper and having an exterior surface. Rather, Feldmesser discloses an insulator made of porcelain. This is clear from the entire disclosure of Feldmesser, starting from the abstract, which states, "It is the purpose of the present invention to impart to ceramic insulators water repellent properties . . ." Feldmesser

discloses coating the porcelain insulators with PTFE. Feldmesser does not relate to bushings, does not disclose an insulating core of a bushing and does not disclose an insulating core including a composite material including epoxy resin impregnated paper.

Feldmesser discloses coating the ceramic insulators to prevent formation of a water film on the ceramic insulators. On the other hand, the claimed invention prevents moisture ingress into an insulating core of a bushing where the insulating core is made of a composite material including epoxy resin impregnated paper. Therefore, Feldmesser relates to different structures made of different materials and addresses different problems as compared to the claimed invention. Feldmesser does not disclose applying a moisture diffusion barrier including a continuous film with firm adhesion to an insulating core of a bushing.

In view of the above, Feldmesser does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 17. Since Feldmesser does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 17, the invention recited in claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 17 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International*

Trade Commissioner, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Feldmesser does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, which includes the subject matter of claim 3, 7-9, and 16 since, among other things, Feldmesser does not suggest a bushing that includes an insulating core including a composite material including epoxy resin impregnated paper and having an exterior surface. Rather, Feldmesser discloses an insulator made of porcelain. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Feldmesser does not differ from the claimed invention as a mere substitution of materials. At least in part since the claimed invention relates to a busing including an insulating core and Feldmesser relates to insulators, it would not be obvious to substitute the materials. The Examiner goes on to assert that it is "within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use". However, Feldmesser and the claimed invention relate to different structures having different uses.

Additionally, with respect to claims 7-9 and 16, it would not be obvious to substitute a multi-layer film or film including the claimed materials or having the claimed permeability to water for the coating suggested by Feldmesser. As noted above, Feldmesser and the claimed invention address different problems with different structures made of different materials. It would not be obvious to make such substitutions. At the very least, the results would not be predictable.

In view of the above, Feldmesser does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 7-9, and 16. Therefore, the invention recited in claims 1, 7-9, and 16 is not obvious in view of

Feldmesser. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the reference relied upon in the office action does not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Consequently, the reference relied upon in the office action does not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Hence, the claimed invention is patentable over the cited reference and Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited reference.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this case and issuance of the notice of allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2011

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300